G.R.S. IX—5]

Previous references 1921. **File No.** 389-21.

Mucz 573-20/51-2 — (Muzrai)
R 2 56-01-

Serial Nos. ~~1 2 3 5 9 — 18~~
1 — 18

Later references.

Muz. 139-23- 2+3
4 6
255-27-1-2

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 18.

Part B for July 23

SUBJECT

Restoration of the inam lands endowed to the Sri Channa Kesava Devaru and Prasadevaru temples at Thelagote Chitaldrug Taluk

To The Muzrai Court
No 150 & 25-7-23

(18) Passes orders to lease of the Inam lands endowed to Sri Kilkote Channa Devaru temple in Chitaldrug Tk

Printed on the Multigraph

1921.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Judicial)

NOTES.

File No.

FILE HEADING.

Restoration of the inam lands entered in the Chenchu-encumbered and Pannaikkarans at Kelagole, Cuddapah dist.

From

The Dy Comr, Cuddapah dist.

No. 272 Rev/Ct Dated 22.10.20 Received 5.12.21

Diary No. 2202	Enclos. 1 file Spare Copies. –	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER

Forwarding Copy of petition from inamdars in Kelagole Estate, Cuddapah dist. praying for the restoration of inam lands situated at Kelagole, taken away under Act I of 1908.

As per G.O. 18th Mar. 1908	No 1911-2 NOTES AND ORDERS. Copy of petition referred to in the above letter.
(2)	Letter No C 272 Rev/Ct dt 22 Oct 1920 from the Dy Comr of Cuddapah submitting the petition for orders.

NOTES—First Sheet.

R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Revs File No. 389 of 1921.

Serial No.

Survey nos 4, 61 and 62 of Kelagote village in the Chitaldrug Taluk Comprising of 40 acres and 34 guntas of dry land and 4 acres and five guntas of garden land were endowed as inam to the Sri Prasanna Devarus and Channakesava Devarus temples at the place and these lands were granted to one Govinda Rao, late Subadar of the Chitaldrug Taluk, for raising a Tulasi and flower garden and for arranging for worship in the two temples referred to above. After the death of the Govinda Rao the properties passed into the hands of his descendants who neglected to adhere to the conditions of grant, and about the year 189 when the lands were the management of an

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Rev File No. 389 of 1921

Serial No.

C. Bheema Rao who was himself a Police Inspector in H.H. the Nizam's State matters got so bad, the the then Dy Com. of the Dt. recommended that the land ~~may~~ Mulkhs be resumed to Govt. as the conditions of the grant were not fulfilled. Upon the lands in question were ordered to be resumed in G.O no 1911-2/Inspection 560/1901-02 dated the 18th Nov 1903.

2) In his petition dated 9th May 1921, C. Venkata Rao Station Master, Chitaldrug, who claimed himself to be a direct descendant of the late Rev Govinda Rao, applied to Govt. for the restoration of the inam lands resumed to Govt. according to the G.O. referred to above on the ground that at the time when the resumption

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

of the main land was ordered. He was a young man living far away from Chikalderu, that the then Manager C. Bheema Rao, was an absentee from the place being employed in H.H. the Nizam's State, the Police Force, and that the properties for the year got mismanaged and that if the lands were now restored to him, he would manage them well properly.

3) The petitioner claimed that the lands were all given to his family and not devoted to the temples as alleged. But in the office endorsement No 571 of 6th August 1924 by C. Venkata Rao, the petitioner was informed that no fresh facts were adduced for a reconsideration of the original order dated 18th March 1903

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Revs File No. 389 of 15

Serial No

PUR

4 In the papers under this spesal, the Dy Comr, Calicut drug district, now reports that the mantap, Nagarakallu, Aswatha Kattes and the well are all in a deteriorated condition, that the garden lands have all been denuded of fruit trees and that the inam lands (dry ~~which~~ which were intended for growing Tulasi do not now contain a single tulasi plant, but is over grown with lantana &c.

The Dy Comr, further states that in his opinion the lands that were resumed in 1903 were all lands granted to the family as ~~property~~ to be enjoyed by them hereditarily on condition of growing tulsi for daily worship at the temples, and recommends that the inam lands which have

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Vacy File No. 385 of 1904.

Serial No.

resumed may be ordered to be restored to the management of the petitioner, who is stated to be very earnest to improve the said inam land and the topes and to carry out the grant and to maintain the dignity of the family.

5. From the Dy Comr's report it is seen that matters have not very much improved since the ~~date~~ period of the resumption of the inam lands.

6. Subd for orders with previous references.

C.S. 13/12/04 The inam extract Subd (a) with the records shows that "the land is in the sole & hereditary enjoyment "of Venkoba Rau" & two others who were the "ancestors of the petr. (Vide genealogical Tree in the Vernl records). The inams were resumed in 1903 owing to proved mismanagement of the then Manager, who was the petr who applied for having just

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

possession of the lands and asked to manage them satisfactorily was told in August 1921 that no fresh facts were adduced to reconsider the order passed in 1903.

8 The Dy Comr now brings to notice that the institution & lands have not improved since their resumption and recommends that the Sets who is anxious to improve the inam lands and manage the temple satisfactorily may be put in possession of the same.

9 It is a matter for consideration whether the recommendation of the Dy Comr may be sanctioned, say, for a period of 3 years in the first instance and thus give the Sets a chance of managing the temple and lands which have been granted as inam to the Sets' ancestors.

Submitted for orders

BG

16/12/24.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. | of 19 24

Serial No.

10) Send for the record of Misc Case 220 of 1896-97 and Ex Case 12 of 1896-97 from the file of the Sub Judge, Shimoga. Addl. Sub Judge, Shimoga. U.P. 23/12/21

C.C. 23/12/21 11) Sub for appl C.C. 23/12/21 Sd 23/12/21 (2) Issue U.P. 23/12/21

3 To, District Judge Shimoga Dn. Ori. No. 3199 dt. 23-12-21 Calls for the records of the Misc. C. Case No. 220 of 1896-97 & the Ex. Case No. 12 of 1896-97 on the file of the Sub Judge, Shimoga

4 From the Dt Judge Shimoga. No. 2604/522 dt 31-12-21. Forwards the records in Misc No. 220 of 96-97 — Subt for orders Sd 3/1/22

13) The first Complaint is that the Order of 1st

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

Sri I was ~~not~~ present & Pandit G. Bhima Rao who was Advocate for the Manager of the Mutt Institution applied on 12 March and 14 March 1904 for a Review of this Order but it was not decided. (Vide Order 2577 dated 20 January 1905 and endorsement of the same date)

12) The next main point is that the Swami is illegal and not Devaka. This question has been discussed at length in the notes in my Order 56 of 1901-2 and the Order passed by the late Sir T. V. Sundara Murti was that the Swami was Devaka.

15) A former application for a Re-Consideration of this Order was rejected on 6.8.1921.

16) There should be some finality in such Matters and it is a Matter for Consideration whether a Question decided about 17 years should now be re-opened

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. | of 19

Serial No.

1

17) (Second Member) W.J. 16/1/22

18) No any condition under which I am prepared to open this case has is if the Mungoni Supt. during his tours, with respect the Chemple lands &c. to interrogate the ~~applicants~~ petitioners make local Enquiries and submit a detailed report with his recommendation if any.

Rec'd
22. 1. 22 W 27/1/22

Supt. Mungoni
Rec'd 23/1/22

His Hon. the Senior Member when in Charlestown 23/1/22

19) This file may if appd. be sent unofficially to the Mungoni Comm'r in response to [illegible]

By
4. 2. 22

20) (First Member) W.J. 4/2/22

21) Approved
Rec'd
12-2-22 W 14/2/22

2091-230
4.2.22

C 45/22 8/15 Feb 22

22) Forwarded, with Copy of enclosure to the Mungoni Commissioner for Report.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. of 19

Serial No.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT
14-9-22
MUZRAI
W.O. No. 32

In favour of inspection and report.

Kingsland
14.9.22

By order
Secy. to Govt. Revenue Dept.

Reed 15-9-22.

Put on
a memo and be submitted
to Govt. Thursday
Ens. 10/9
12

NOTE—Contn sheet.

R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. of 19

Dev. 248-
R. 12-22

Serial No.

(3) The matter having been before Government more than once, they have rejected the application for the restoration of the Inam and also declined to reopen the case. As observed by Mr. Jayarama Aiyar in his note dated 16th January 1922, there should be some finality in these matters and the question should not be allowed to be reopened and ~~finally~~ again dealt with every time that an application is made by some body for a reconsideration of the previous order. In this view I am of opinion that the application may be rejected.

(4) If nevertheless the Government shall consider that a report should be submitted after inspection of the locality by the Inspector Commissioner before final orders are passed, this will be done and a full report submitted.

Chairman

To the Revenue Department with compliments.

In paras 18 & 21 above, the member has been pleased to direct that the Mirasi Sahukar during his tour "inspect the temple, "lands &c, interrogate the Ryots, make "local enquiries & submit a detailed report "with his recommendations, if any."

This is quoted in such a manner as to create a wrong impression. What was actually considered under which was proposed to reopen the case as quoted in the note of the Inspector-in-charge. The matter has been brought to notice that the M.L. has misrepresented the matter & this is quite incorrect.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

Serial No.

was placed in the role of hereditary engagement of Venkatachalam & thus the whose descendant the Petr is and was to procure them and manage the lan satisfactorily.

16 May the papers be sent again to the Mag Coll with the request to as already desired he will kindly inspect the temple, lands &c and submit a detailed report on the practicability?

Sd
11/12/22.

Revd Member) 11/12/22

4886-378
12.12.22

17 In view of what the M.C. has said I am not prepared to order the case being reopened now.

Sd 13/12/22
13.12.22

18/12/22
25 Draft Rect is subd.

Sd
14/12/22

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Mrz File No. 389 of 1922.

Serial No.

AV 14/12

VG

Has not just been informed that M. C. will inspect the institutions? Please put up Ref

VJ 14/12/22

In endorsement no 579 DJ 1-8-22 (Sl. 6), the petr has been informed that "the matter is reserved for personal inspection by the Muzrai Supdt when next he visits the place".

In his Petition Dj 22-8-1922 (Sl. 8) while pointing out that the lands were not granted as Devadaya to Sri Chennakesava Devaru and Prana Devaru temples, but they were given to his grandfather Subedar Govinda Rao, Mr Venkata Rao requests to be informed of the exact date on which the Muzrai Supdt will inspect the lands so that he may wait upon that officer and offer his explanation).

Submitted for orders

MM 15-12-22

First Member 15/12/22

VJ 15/12/22

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Q.7.0

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Inward File No. 389 of 19

Serial No.

4996-4988
16.12.22

Painted like this Shd have a heading known to him at the right moment had he noted at the relevant time
Rec

31 I see that the Petn has been informed from Engl. that the case is to be a local Enquiry made by the M. Engr. I am afraid he cannot take action this. The D.C. may be approached for position.

Rec
28.12.22 W/28/12/22

Dy. Secy. Finance
31-12-22
2/1/23
Finl. Member W/2.1.23

5647-331
12.1.23

Action as proposed
Rec -
03.1.23 W/3/1/23

9 No. 2102 S) 18.1.23 to the Mun. Commr.

Requests to inspect the temples in question and send up a further detailed report for orders —

Rec

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Imz File No. 389 of 1921.

Serial No.

10. From, the Imz Comr.

Letter no C 1041 dd 21.2.1923.

Reports that the present lease of The temple land expires in June 19 and recommends that as the pets from to remain at the place and took a the improvement of the land for benefit of the institution, and as Sir have laid it down in their order of 18th Janry. 1923. that Devadaya land need not be auctioned for highest bid, and that the good preservation of the land is the important consideration, the l of the land to the pets fr the same amount appears to be desirable.

M

The Imz. Comrs. letter explain the facts of the case.

Submit for orders.

AU 8/2/1923

The G.O Gupta ?
by the M.C refers us to lands which are in the possession of

NOTE—Contn sheet.

G. R. S. III-2.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 389 of 1927

Serial No.

Servants who have left in employment of theirs - I do not think that the Circuit pleader is a suitable servant but he has to undoubtedly be taken out of paraphernalia.

Nevertheless the Land may be put in his possession as a tenant for a period of five years & later ten years, for a reasonable rent to be fixed by the Dy Commr

Final Minutes) VJ 27/2/23

(e got back from Member's office 9-3-1923)

M

29/3

11 From, the Asst. Commr

Letter no. C. 1041 Dy 6. 3. 1923.

Forwards petition from one Koneri Rao advancing his claim to the management of the estate and requests that the passing of order may be deferred till after he consults Mr Kalpana Srinivasa Rao and makes a further communication in the matter.

Submit - the further report from may be awaited

M 9.3.1923 The P.M. now received from Koneri Rao and all connected papers on the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. | of 19

Serial No.

A

Subject may be returned to the Mercy. Comr. with a request that the matter may be thoroughly investigated and a clear final report sub. within about 2 months.

RG
9/8/23

7579-382
15-3-23

Chief Minister) 11/8/23

A. approved.

41

Chief
16.3.23 - 4/16/3/23

AV
16/3/23

Dept. Secretary.

42 M 20/3/23 Chief 11/8/23

12

No 2543 A 28/3/23 to Chief Min. Comm.

Calls for a report

Sec

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2,

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. of 19

Serial No. 13.

From, The Inspr Coorg
Letter no. C.1041 Dy 16.4.1923.
Reports from enquiries made
by Mr Karpur Srinivasa Rao,
that Koneri Rao is the direct
descendant of the Former Govinda
Rao, the founder of the institution,
that he has also seen the young
man - Koneri Rao - who seems to
be capable, that the original
petr Venkata Rao cannot be
preferred to Koneri Rao, and re-
commends that the lease of the
said lands may, after its expiry
by the end of 1923-24, be
given to Koneri Rao in pre-
ference to Venkata Rao.
(4) The rival claimants to the
Vahivat of Sri Chamundeswara
Devasthana and Sri Prana Devasthana
temples at Kelakote Village, Nikshi
Taluk, are (1) C. Venkata Rao,
Ry. Station master - orgl petr.
and (2) Mr C. Koneri Rao, Operator
Jewel Filter Clinic whose favour
the Insp. Coorg has made

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

present recommendation.

A. From the geneological tree Mr Koneri Rao, it is seen that he is the direct descendant of the Zamindar Govinda Rao. Founder of the Vishakhapatnam Venkata Rao original petr. belongs to the family of the 2nd wife's son who was given away in adoption to Zamindar Govinda Rao's brother Mr Srinivasa Rao. Zamindar Govinda Rao is Mr Karpur Srinivasa Rao's mother's paternal grand-father (Mr Karpur Srinivasa Rao's mother is living)

B. Mr Karpur Srinivasa Rao states that the entries in the geneological tree are correct to the best of his knowledge.

C. The geneological tree produced by the orgl petr Mr Venkata Rao is before me. He states that Govinda Rao's eldest son is Bhimia Rao whose line is extinct. That he is the ground for

°NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 19

Serial No.

of another Venkatadri Rao, 2nd
Son of Govinda Rao and that
Koneri Rao, eldest son of
Govinda Rao according to the
genealogical tree of Koneri Rao,
is the brother of Govinda Rao.
It is likely that the detailed
main register pertaining to the
temple Cases, and the main
Statement filed at the
time of the main settlement,
may throw light on the relation-
ship of the parties, and
if a corroboration is desirable,
these documents will be called
for from the Main Sub-
Registrar. Jan 1924

19/4/23 19/4/23

46 [illegible]

Dy. Dy. Sub-Registrar. Jan
20/4/23 28/4/23

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

F. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Inam File No. 389 of 1921

Serial No.	
14	From Mr C. Koneri Rao Petition dy 19.4.23. States that he is the living heir of Jouzdar Koneri Rao eldest son of Jouzdar Govinda Rao, Venkata Rao belongs to the adopted family; and prays that the Inam of the temple and its wiza lands etc. may be handed over to him, so that he may as the legal heir conduct Pujas, Utsavas etc.
15	To, the Inam Supdt. Letter no. 2761 dy 27.4.23. Calls for copies of the Extended Inam Register with copies of Statements filed at the Inam settlements.
16.	From Mr C Venkata Rao Petition dy 12.5.23 Addressed to the Member of Council makes further representations in the matter.

Geological fee) A.

Member's orders on petition — Inam Supdt. should report

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 389 of 1924

13

Serial No.	
17.	Inam, re Inam Supdt Letter no. 296 Dy 14.5.23 forward copies of the detailed Inam Register and the Statement filed at the time of the Inam Settlement of 1868.
T.	49 A geneological tree has been filed by the parties at the time of the Inam Settlement of 1868. It shows that Koneri Rao is the direct descendant of the Zamindar Govinda Rao, founder of the Venkatagiri Estate and the statement made by the petr. Mr. Koneri Rao (A) and further supported by Mr. Harper Govindasa Rao (B) as well as the Inam. Commr in his favour.
(A+C)	50 The 1st petr. Venkatesa Rao comes from the family

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mus File No. 389. of 19 21

Serial No.

of Govinda Rao 2nd Wife's son Venkata Rao. who is stated to have been given away in adoption to Govinda Rao's brother Srinivasa Rao. In the genealogical tree filed at the time of the Inam Settlement, the two sons to have been omitted. 5/ Mr. Venkata Rao has petitioned making further representations in the matter which are summarized in the petition. 6/ The case had been referred to the Mus. Comr. for investigation and report. Mr. Venkata Rao admits that he appeared before the Mus. Comr. on the 27th March 1923 for enquiry and it is not known why these allegations were not made before that date.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 389 of 19 21

Serial No.

appears to be that his father and grand-father were Mysore Govt officers, and were not able to be present at the time of the Inam Settlement &c. The Inam Settlement took place in 1868 and it is a point for consideration whether at this distance of time, the pets. may be permitted to call into question the settlement that was made.

4. Mr Venkata Rao states that Mr Kashee Srinivasa Rao is only 63 years old and that it is not known how this gentleman got the information that his grand-father was adopted some 100 years back. From the genealogical tree, it is seen that Mr Kashee Srinivasa Rao's mother is living.

5. Mr Venkata Rao also states that the information given by Mr Kashee Srinivasa Rao

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Anz File No. 389 of 1921.

Serial No.

is not to be relied upon, because this letter might have been written, to give shelter to his widowed sister who is living with etc.

So the Anz. Collr states that he has seen Dr. Kunen Roo who seems to be capable, and recommends that the lease, may be given to him in preference to Mr. Venkata Rao.

Submit for orders.

AV 21/5/23

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

5 G O N D 1911-2 & 18 3-03 [illegible]
a history of the grant of the
Inam lands in question & the
Reservedwars & Anjaneya Inam
temple at Nidadavolu, and
their resumption and the
mismanagement by the [illegible]
-dents of the original [illegible]
The lands were [illegible]
Tripadas [illegible]
for Rs. 1-8. The [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No.

of 19

Serial No.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

Serial No.

Mdrs File No. 30 (of 19

Serial No.	
56	The present application has been sent up by C. Venkata Rau, a Stamp Vendor of one year's standing. He is a Station Master in one of the Stations in the Nizam's State (I think at Mandagere) and on his B.P. dt. 14.5.21 he prayed that as his letter was received by the Collector when the lands were ordered to be taken under Act I of 1894, they should be treated as those in the Madras Districts and prayed that the lands might be placed under Act II of 1899 & that the terms of the original grant & the terms of the Honour Inam Rules. His B.P. was rejected vide Rc. No. 571/Inam-175 dt. 7.6.21 Simultaneously with his B.P. his office, the Petitioner, has filed petitions in the Madras Courts and by Counsel also. The Petitioner Mr. C. Venkata Rau, has [illegible] Petn and [illegible] matter and [illegible]

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File N of 19

Serial No.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

the Lands Act Venkatadam for the possession of the Kumri lands. The Mun: Comr has supported the Petn of Kumri Ram.

60 The Petr Kumri Ram happens to be the grandson of one Komuria who was the half brother of Ajeenia Ram of the Srau settlement who does not seem to have any interest in the management of the lands.

61 It is doubtful whether after the distance of time, G.O. No. 194-12 of 18th March 1903 which is sought to be revised now, for deciding on both the Petrs Venkatadam & Kumri Ram are for demands and the handing over possession of the Boodaga Srau lands to the Petr Kumri Ram and to the Management now in.

The Mun: Comr recommends that the lands may be kept in possession of Govt

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

N.R. File No. of 19

Serial No.

~~[illegible]~~ 62

Rev Secy) Secy 25/5/23

22/5/23

63 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 24/5/23

9732-183
26.5.23

64 The case has not been heard by the Nizami Commn, Hyd Case Hyd. Jurisdiction in Dn. If this view is correct the records may be transmitted to the Nizami Commn for disposal, leaving it to the aggrieved party to prefer an appeal to such.

Rev
28-5-23

24 29/5/23

In this office letter no. 2543 dy 23-3-1923, the Nizami Comn was requested to investigate this matter thoroughly, and submit a clear final report to

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mus File No. 389 of 1921.

Serial No.

P. W. D. in Para 5 of Mr. Venkata Rao's petition Dt 12.5.23 (2 G).

orders of Govt, and that officer has accordingly submitted his present report for orders of Govt. after hearing the contending parties.

Submitted for orders with a Dft. [illegible]

66 AP 29/8/23.

[illegible] say that they would [illegible] the [illegible] who can [illegible] them. Govt. it done [illegible] a regular hearing has ordered [illegible].

67 [illegible]

68 1/9/23 (Revisey) 1/9/23

69 As the applicants desire a re-consideration of G.O. [illegible] the W. & C. Secretary [illegible]

70 This can be [illegible]

0063-214

NOTES Contin. sheet.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 36G of 19

Serial No.

in July next at the Council. It is too early to fix a date for the case. It can be done some time next month.

Dealt
9.6.23

AV 11/6

71 Orders are solicited as to the date to which the case may be posted for hearing hereafter.

Sd/- 7/6/23
(2nd member)

30.6.23
2-7 Bh
3/7/23

86.
3.7.23

73 I find that the point as to which the case has been remanded in this order above & that there has been a good & unnecessary nesting. Before dealing with the ~~declaration~~ ~~points~~ raised therein ~~in this case~~ which is the fundamental claim that in Dharmapuri ~~the restoration of the lands~~ has to be decided [illegible] in the ~~petition~~ first place whether a proper case has been made out for a second remand [illegible]

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 36 of 19 21

Serial No.

It has been ordered that Mr. Lewis should be taken on by him hands, & Bhandara, & posted to the Executive Engineer. It is proposed that he should be given the pay of Rs. 250 in the pay in the Provincial Service.

Secretary

Your reference is respectfully invited to para 13 & 16 of page 8 of the Civil Service Rules [illegible] Mr. Lewis [illegible] the Executive Engineer [illegible] finally in both the cases & also [illegible] the Executive Engineer [illegible] I [illegible]

But in view of the [illegible] proposed [illegible] Mr. Lewis [illegible] January 1921 [illegible] under which [illegible] this case [illegible] will be [illegible] regarding the Public Works [illegible] local engineers [illegible] with his [illegible]

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0361—GPB—3750—18 22

the papers were [illegible] Nagpur Commissioner [illegible]

Muzrai Secretariat | Muz. File No. 3/1 of 192

Serial No.

16 The Muzrai Comr., the present Acting Member Nomeid, was pleased to agree with the Revenue Dept's views that the case need not be reopened, and said × that if still further enquiry was necessary, he would inspect the temple & submit a report.

17. The Member Nomeid was (vide para 27) not prepared to reopen the case.

18 But as the Govt had already been informed that a local enquiry would be conducted by the Muzrai Dept (now by Muz: Comr), and a Petn from one Kineri Rau, another claimant for the possession of the lands had been recd, the papers were again referred, under the orders of the Member to the Muz: Comr for a thorough investigation of the case and the submission of a final & clear report.

19 The Muz Comr investigated the claims of both the parties & sent up a report recommending that the lands might be put in possession of the new claimant Kineri Rau

Appeal in para 61 ? ??

Appeal note, Thos [illegible]

× vide paras 23 & 24 above

NOTE—Contn sheet

WD 0861—GPB—3750—1 8 22

Serial No.

~~[illegible]~~

[illegible] whether it is desirable to entrust the lands to [illegible] claimants, [illegible]

[illegible]

DS 7/12/23

DC (Revenue) 7/12/23

506-
19.7.23.

(Secretary) 19/12/23

As I have already shown there has been a good deal of unnecessary & irrelevant matter in this case.

The Govt. having decided so far back as 1903 that the lands in question were devadayam & that the alienations & the Inam grants should be cancelled the lands resumed & restored to the temple, there can be no conclusive evidence that I am now prepared to go behind it as the Inam Tribunal & the

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0861—GPB—3750—1 8 22

Muzrai Secretariat

Muz. File No. 3[illegible] of 192[illegible].

Serial No.

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0861—GPB—3750—1 8 22

Muz. File No. 307 of 192

Serial No

The Rev Com may be asked to take necessary action accordingly. The records returned herewith

Draft
Secy 24/7/23

Secy 24/7/23.

24/7/23

(W 20)

Dfh. Secretl.

Issue
Secy 25/7/23

25/7/23

18 Do for Dfh to the Rev. Comm.

Passes orders re lease of the Inam lands endowed to the Kilkodu Chamundeswari Kesava devaru Temple in Chikkodu Tq

NOTE—Contn sheet

WD 0361—GPB—3750—1 8 22

2292266 of 41

191

From C. Venkata Rao Esquire B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Chitaldrug.

389-21-1

To T.V. Jayarama Iyer Esq B.A., B.L
Secretary to Government,
Muzrai Department, Bangalore.

Dated 30 NOV

Despatched 29th November 1921.

Received

General No C.272 Rev Pet of 21-22
No.

Enclosure No One petition with eight enclosures.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith the petition received from Mr. C. Venkata Rao praying for the restoration of certain inam lands situated at Kelagote village which were resumed in 1903 and to state that the petitioner has presented another

Sabs

In reply to the application presented by Venkata Rao in this office, he was given to understand vide Secy's No S-71/Muz S 23-20-2 dt 6-8-21 (9th E). The said was not open to the Govt. in spite of this Secy's to make an enquiry & submit a report which has not been called for from him

However the promised report may be awaited

BG
30/11/21

application in the matter relating to which I am making an enquiry and on completion I shall submit a detailed report.

I have the honor to be,

S I R,

Your most obedient servan

Deputy Commissioner

S.V. Chitaldrug District

29/8/13

243

The Muzarai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

Most Respected Sir,

As per your good self's order of yesterday, I most humbly beg to submit the following copies of memorials submitted to H.H. The Maharaja of Mysore to prove that I am the great grand son of Chitaldurg Subedar Govinda Rao and another application submitted by the last enjoyer of the inam in question named C. Bheema Rao addressed to Mahamed Alli Khan, Bahadur, Deputy Commissioner of Chitaldurg District. A for your good self's kind perusal and request that the lease orders of the Inam may kindly be ordered in my name as promised.

1. Copy of the memorial submitted by my father C. Nana Rao, pensioned Risaldar to H.H. The Maharaja of Mysore dated 16th Dec' 1912 in which he has clearly stated that he is the grand son of Chitaldurg Govinda Rao and he is the sond of Chitaldurg Venkata Rao.

2. One application addressed by my father, C. Nana Rao to Sir, M. Visvesvariah, K.C.I., M.I.C.E., C.I.E., dated 4-5-14 in which he has clearly stated that his grand father is Chitaldurg Govinda Rao with one enclosure petition to the same address dated 7th March 1911.

3. Copy of the Memorial was submitted to Sri Krishnaraja Wodayar Bahadur, G.C.S.I., H.H. The Maharaja of Mysore, by the undersigned in June 1900.

4. One copy of application addressed to Mahomed Alli Khan Bahadur, Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldurg District. by C. Bheema Rao, the last enjoyer of the inam lands in which he has clearly stated that his elders have served as Mousdari, Bakshi, Amildari and Risaldari. This Mousdar, Chitaldurg Govinda Rao is my great grand father and Bakshi Chitaldurg Venkata Rao is my grand father and Chitaldurg Nana Rao is the

only Risaldar, the applicant's father in the family above records are prior to the attempts made by me in getting this Inam in my favour, so much to say, that only on account of this Inam land I am not telling that I am the great grand son of Chitaldurg Govinda Rao and it is I who have worked from the beginning to get back this Inam land as it was in a deteriorated condition to bring it to a fertile condition.

5. If necessary a reference may be made to the Officers concerned to know the facts of the memorials etc., submitted by the undersigned and his father to the Chief Commandant etc

6. Besides this, my father has given material help to the last enjoyer, C. Bheema Rao to liquidate the debts incurred upon this Inam land which fact I have recorded in the memoria submitted to Rajaseva Dhurina, Sir T. Kantaraja Urs, B.A., L.C.L.E., C.I.E., late Dewan of Mysore dated 26th November 21.

In conclusion, I beg of your generous good self to kindly consider the facts laid above and to pass favourable orders to me in leasing out the Inam lands in question.

I beg to remain,

S I R,

Your most obedient servant,

C. Venkataraos
Station Master
Mandagere.

Colonel Sree Krishna Rajendra Wadayer Bahadoor, G. C. S. I.

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

May it please His Royal Highness,

The humble memorial of Chitldroog Nana Rao, Pensioned Ressaldar, Mysore Cavalry, sheweth:--

That His Highness' humble petitioner discharged his duties with honesty and zeal in the Military Department for a period of nearly 50 years. During the tenure of his service he has attended the battle at Suragur, where he has rendered meretorious services

That his father, Chitldroog Venkata Rao, has served as a judicial Shirestada, or Munsiff and Anchev Buksney or Post Master General of the Mysore Province for a considerable period

That his grand father Chitldroog Govinda Rao, was a Fouzdar or a Commander-in- Chief under the hon'ble Major General Welsley, the Duke of Wellington and was enjoying a pension of a a thousand four hundred rupees together from the British Government and the Government of Mysore till he breathed his last in the year 1811.

The book containing the copies of testimonials, granted by many British Officers, is herein enclosed for his Royal Highness gracious perusal.

That the petitioner and his ancestors have rendered meretorious and distinguished services to the State, he is enjoying the pension for the last 35 years, and is aged nearly one hundred years.

That the memorialist most humbly craves His Royal Hig

to consider the

consider the status and the distinguished services rendered by the petitioner's family and be graciously pleased to appoint his son Chitradroog Venkata Rao as a Military Probationer in the Mysore State.

The memorialist's said son Venkata Rao has studied up to Matriculation Standard, is in very hard circumstances and is in very urgent need of His Royal Highness' benign patronage.

This is the only anxiety that the petitioner is suffering from in his dotage

For which act of kindness the petitioner and his family will ever pray for long life and prosperity to His Royal Highness and His Royal family of Mysore.

Sd. C. Nana Rao,
Pensioned Resaldar,
Mysore Horse,
Residing in Balemutt.
Chickpet,
Bangalore City.

Bangalore City,
4th December 1912.

To,

M. Visvesvaraya Esq., B.A., M.I.C.E., C.I.E.,
Dewan to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
B A N G A L O R E.

Most Respected Sir,

The humble memorial of Chitaldroog Nana Rao pensioned Ressaldar Mysore Cavalry most respectfully and humbly showeth:-

That your humble memorialist has served as a Ressaldar in the Mysore Cavalry for a period of nearly 30 years with zeal and honesty. During the tenure of his service he has -- attended the Batile at Surapur where he has rendered meritorious service to the State.

That his father Chitaldroog Venkata Rao has served as Munsiff and Anchey Bukshey (or Post Master General of the Province) for a considerable period.

That his grand-father Chitaldroog Govinda Rao was a Fouzdar or Commander-in-Chief under the Honourable Major-General Wellesly (the Duke of Wellington) and was enjoying a pension of Rs.600/- from the British Government and Rs.800/- from the Government of Mysore till he breathed his last in the year 1810. The book containing the copies of testimonials granted to the above personage by many British Officers is herein enclosed for your honour's favourable perusal. The memorialist family is in no way inferior to that of Dewan Purniah's in the Mysore State.

That upon the humble representation made to His -- Highness the Maharaja Sree Krishna Rajendra Wadayar Bahadur G.C.S.I. has been graciously pleased to issue an endorsement No. Mily.611-78-12 dated 17th January 1913 stating that the memorial praying his son Chitaldroog Venkata Rao to be appoi ed as Military Probationer has been transferred to the Chief Commandant Mysore State Troops for favourable disposal.

That the memorialist is aged 94 years and owing t· his good old age he is blind and could not hear well, therefore he cannot pay respects to your honour personally.

That the memorialist has not been favoured with hi request till now in the Military Department. That therefore the memorialist most humbly prays your honour to kindly cons the meritorious services rendered by the memorialist and his ancestors to the State and favourably be pleased to appoint his son Chitaldroog Venkata Rao as a Probationer either i n t Military or Police and thus releive him from the anxiety in this dotage.

For which act of kindness he shall ever pr for your honour's long life and prosperity.

Bangalore,

7th March 1914.

He begs to subscribe,

Most Respected Sir,

Your honour's most obedient servan

(Sd). C. Nana Rao,
Pensioned Ressaldar.

Address:

C. Nana Rao,
Pensioned Ressaldar,
// Beli Srinivasa Rao's lane,
Siddikatte, Bangalore City.

Sri Krishnarajendra [illegible],

Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

Mysore.

May it please your [illegible] Highness.

The humble memorial of C. Venkatarao, Subedar [illegible], most humbly sheweth:-

(1). That his grandfather Venkatarao, retired as Subedar or Commandant-in-chief with honorary Major General collected [illegible] meritorious service to the British Army in the [illegible] Kharda territories and [illegible] pension of Rs. 180/- per the British government and Rs. 60/- from the Government of Mysore till he [illegible] Mysore in 1831 A.D.

(2). That his grandfather Venkatarao [illegible] was served as a [illegible] under Bukshy [illegible] General of the Mysore province getting [illegible] of Rs. 30/- per mensem.

(3). That the memorialist's father [illegible] and was served to [illegible] the rank of Subedar on salary of Rs. 112/- per month, during his service he [illegible] to his credit a [illegible] meritorious services and victory as [illegible] Mysore.

(4). That the memorialist is a [illegible] in the Mysore Infantry. [illegible] Highness's service to your esteem Highness he [illegible] the memorialist [illegible] petitions to [illegible] memorialist to [illegible] Commander, Palace, [illegible] Majesty, M. A., [illegible] your Highness to [illegible] willing to [illegible] Officer's [illegible] the memorialist [illegible] Your Highness [illegible] the memorialist [illegible] Your Highness [illegible] the [illegible]

the memorialist was overage to join the cavalry as an officer. Thereupon a request was made by the memorialist to Hon. Maharajah, H.H. to kindly transfer the services of the memorialist to the State Railways.

(5). That the memorialist has a son named C. Raghavendra Rao who has studied the English up-to the School Final Examination aged 18 years fit for the service in the Military.

(6). That the memorialist requests your gracious Highness to be kindly pleased to the meritorious services rendered to the state by the memorialist's ancestors to their utmost loyalty and kindly pass orders to enlist the memorialist's son C. Raghavendra Rao as a Military Probationer (Cavalry) in the Imperial Horse.

For which act of kindness the memorialist will in duty bound be ever grateful to your Highness and pray for the long life and prosperity of your gracious Highness.

I beg to remain,

Your most humble and loyal servant,

[signature]

Station Master,

A. B. G.

20th July '20.

Granted to Mr. C. Venkata Rao, Station Master, Shore Arsikere Railway, Arbuga.

With reference to his petition dated the 20th July 30 addressed to His Highness the Maharaja praying that his son C. Raghavendra Rao may be given a commissioned rank in the army, Mr. C. Venkata Rao is informed that his son's name has been registered and that due intimation will be given to him when the next meeting of the Committee of the - - selection is fixed.

by Order,

Sd/-

for Chief Secretary to Government.

The Huzroi Secretary,

to the Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore, Bangalore.

Sir,

I was directed vide your order No.579/Huz.739-41 of 1- - that the question of restoration of the Inam lands granted by His -- Highness the Maharaja of Mysore to my great grand father Subedar -- Govindarao of Chitaldrug was reserved for the inspection of the - Huzurat superintendent, he went to would visit this place. ---- Accordingly I was given to understand vide Huzurat Commissioner's No. J.1041 of 32-33 of 31-1-1965 to appear before him on the 6th -- instant to represent the facts at Chitaldrug. I had appeared before the Huzurat Superintendent on the 6th instant at Chitaldrug and --- showed him the original Sanad granted to my great grand father --- (Subedar Govinda Rao) and convinced him of the fact that the Inam in question is purely personal as mentioned in the original Sanad. As the Inam in question has been resumed back upon the misrepresentation of the then Deputy Commissioner's report, the personal ---- Inamthi Lands were graciously resumed back by the Government to the Heirs of Sri Shanmuka Iya Devaru and Prasadevaru at Kelakote ----- village in Chitaldrug taluk.

Therefore I beg of your Honour good self to kindly order for the restoration of the Inam lands early, and further beg to -- state that I shall ever be pleased to fulfil the conditions of the - Sanad.

For which act of kindness, I shall be highly grateful.

I beg to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servt.

C Venkatesa

Station Master,



Rao Sri

Dangh

Venkatai (2) Partha Bai) Kasaka

in

Submitted by

S/o Konari Rao

Operator

Vani Vilas water-works

Chitaldrug

(Telugu)

From C. Venkata Rao Esquire B.A.,
389 - 21 - 7.
Deputy Commissioner,
C H I T A L D R U G.

To T.N.Jayarama Iyer Esquire B.A.,I
Secretary to Government,
Muzrai Department, Bangalore.

Dated,

Despatched 30th November 1921.
1-12-21

Received

General No. C. 272 Rev Pet of 21-2,
No.

Enclosure No. Petn with one
Ver file

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No.C. 272 Rev.Pet. dated 29th November 1921 forwarding the petition of Mr.C.Venkata Rao, a descendent of the late Mr. C. Govinda Rao, Fowzdar and founder of the Sri Chennakeshavaswami temple at Kelagc Chitaldrug praying for the restoration the inam lands referred to in the petition, I have the honor to state as follows:- The petitioner presented an application to this office alleging tha the properties endowed to the temple ha greatly deteriorated and the institutio is not being managed satisfactorily. I directed the Amildar to investigate the matter and submit a report which he has accordingly done. He reports that the mantap, Nagarkallus, Asvatha attached all in a deteriorated condition and the water of one well is being polluted by the washing of cloths.

...r und that Tulasi was not ...
... not a single Tulasi plant but is ...
... or shrubs.

... that the inam land seems to ... the Donee and his family fo ... in the year 1903. ... Class ... as can be ... 1911 (vide enclosure No. ... holds the land ... admitted ... have been granted to ... also says speci- ... at his request ... show that the inam is ... is not liable to be ... to the sale. The inam land ... of raising Tulasi ...

... a station master at ... said inam land and the hope &c ... obtain the dignity of ...

... I am sorry that the inam lands which were ... mortgaged to the petitioner.

I have the honour to be,

S I R,

Your most obedient servant,

Deputy Commissioner,

Chitaldrug District.

SUBJECT..... ... .

....

....

Diary No. of letter replied to 2232

Section Inspn

File No. 3 85-21

Serial No 3

General and Revenue Secretariat

(VU)

, *the* 191 .

No 3199

Date of issue 23-12-21

To The Dt. Judge,
Shimoga Divn
Shimoga

Signed by Addl. J. C. Judge

Sir,

I am directed to request you to let us have as soon as possible forward for perusal the records in ~~Misc. Case~~ M/- Misc. Case No 220 of 1921-22.

over.

896-97 On the file of the Court of the Subordinate Judge of Shimoga.

These will be returned to the Court as early as practicable thereafter.

Secy to Govt,
Revenue Dept

23/12/21

C.C.
23/12/21

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

The Secretary to the Government (60)

Muzarai Department,

Bangalore.

Dated 28.12 December, 1921

Despatched. 28/12

Received.

General No. 2604 31 DEC 1921
No. 522

Enclosure No. one cover.

Sir,

With reference to your No. 3199/ Muz.389-21-3 dated 23rd December, 1921 I have the honour to forward herewith the records in Mis.Case No. 220of 1896-97(only the Order) and Execution Case No. 12 of 1896-97 on the file of the - Subordinate Judge, Shimoga, and to - request that the same may be returned when done with.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

10-97 [illegible]

District Judge,

Shimoga Division.

Central Jail Press, Bangalore — 1-9-93.— 32,002.

Signature

Signature

Signature



ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆನಂ	ಮು ಕೊಲ್ಲೂರ ಅ ನಲುನಂ 64 ಕ್ಕೆ 95-96
ವಾದಿ	ಶ್ರೀ ಮಠದ ದಲ್ಲಾಲರ ತಿಪ್ಪೆಕೆಳಗಡೆ ಸ್ವೀಲು ಮಿಡಿತ ಸರಕಾರ್ರ ಅಂತ ಸೆಳ್ಳಿ
ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ	ಚಿಲಿಮರಾಕ್ಷ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಠದ ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ ಕಾರ್ಯ
ಡಿಕ್ರಿತಾರೀಖು	26-2-96
ಅಪ್ಪೀಲು ತೀರ್ಪಾದಮೊಕ್ಕಾ	ಮುಟ್ಟಿ
ಅಪೀಲಿನಲ್ಲಿಸರ್ವತ್ರ ಸ್ಥಾನವಾಗಿದೆಯೆ	ಮುಟ್ಟಿ
ಯಂದೆಪಾರಿಕ್ಕ ಮುನವಡಿಗೆಯೋ ಏನುವಲಿತಾರ್ಥ	ಮುಟ್ಟಿ

ಒತಕ್ಕೆಬೊಂಬಲಗಿನತಪ್ಪೀಲ್

	ರೂ	ಆ	ಪೈ
ಡಿಕ್ರಿಪೊಂಬಲಗು	1817	-	-
ಡಿಕ್ರಿಲ ಕಾಂಪೆಕ್ಕಾಯಿಸಿ	168	6	9
ಸಾಬಕುಜಾವಿಖರ್ಚ			
ಹಾಲಿ ಆಮರ್ಜಂಲರೀಖರ್ಚು	1	-	-
ಕಾಪಿಲರಾಗೋಡು	1	6	6
ಚಾಪ್ಟ್ಕೊಟ್ಟಿ 26 2-96 ಕ್ಕೆ ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ 2-6-96 ರಂದು ಪಮ್ಮಾಲ್ಲಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಕಾಗದಕ್ಕೆ	29	8	4
ವಸೂಲ್ 181 ಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಖರ್ಚು	25	-	-
ಜಂತಾಬಾಕಿ	2042	5	7

ಯೆನಾದೆಮೀಲ್ ಜಾರಿತಬೇಕ್ಕು — ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಕಲಿಕ

ಕೋರ್ಟಿನವರ ನಮಾಯಿತ

ಲಕ್ಷಳುಳ್ಳ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸ್ವತ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಡಿಕ್ರಿ
ಯಂತೆ ಹರಾಜು ಮಾಡಿ ಡಿಕ್ರಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಬೇಕು
ಎಂದು ಈ ನಲ್ಲಾನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಪ್ರಕಾರ
ಆಗಬೇಕಾದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಲು ಆಜ್ಞೆ ಮಾಡಿದೆ

ಸಹಿ

ಸಹಿ

ಜಪ್ತಿಗೆ ಒರಿನಿವ ಪಟೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಕಾಯಿದೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾದ ಬತ್ತೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ

ತಾ ರವರು

ಸಹಿ

189

This is an applicⁿ for the execution of the decree in O.S. No 640 of 1895-96 on the file of this court —

Date of Decree — 26-2-96

Within one year from date of decree —

Prays for the attachment and sale of the immoveable properties described in the annexed schedule with the cost.

Advocate's fee is claimed at Rs 25/-

(Revenue Stamp not affixed)

8 June 96

Rev: Stamp of Rs 1 is filed in a week from today - Attachment & sale made & this Writ returned on 25th Aug 96 — In the file — Pl in 3 days —

B.J

13 Aug 96

Date for return of Writ of attachment is extended to 1st Oct 96 —

B.J

Process fee has not been paid

To be paid in 3 days

Atty Advocate's fee

unpaid 30 Oct 96

B.J

30.10.96. 21/10/96

Plaintiff by Mr Setu Rao

Debtor - absent

Immovables worth Rs 86/- attached.

Copies of prohibitory order and claimants notice have been stuck up to temple after due proclamation

notice to Deft served on house. The Tahsildar of Chitaldoorg reports that there is no Kandayam due to Govt from the attached properties

Govt all
Interests all?
No claims.

Mr Affidavit is in
Plff. Sale for
21 & 22 Dec: 96.
sale warrant to be returnable 28/10/96 by
on 8. 1. 97.

27. 11. 96.

Plaintiff's adv: Mr Setu Rao has put in an application praying that Plaintiff may be permitted to bid in the auction the properties put up for sale.

Mr Affidavit is not filed.

17. 12. 96.

app^{n} (no: 86 of 96-7) ~~for staying~~ by deft for staying sale was rejected.

Sub Judge

Stay order of
Daya Daya lands respond
& in the Church W.P. 4, 61 & 62 &
are
18/12/96

& posted for
hearing on
22-1-97
22.1.97

8.1.97.

Plaintiff by Mr Setu Ram.

Debtor:- absent.

Sale not effected as time was granted by plaintiff to Deft.

22/Jan/97

Ready unless stay order

Sale

Adj

12/2/97

22/2/97

12/2/97

Hte Atty

In the Court of the Subordinate Judge
Shimoga

Present P. Singara Char Esquire
Subordinate Judge

Civil Execution Appn No. 12 of 1896-97.

Petitioner — vs — Counter-Petitioner

Deputy Commissioner of Chitaldoorg

Sarafh Linga Setty (Offr)

Bhema Rao (P+f)

22-1-97

Order

The Dy Comr with Lr dated 22/1/97 & encl. the order passed in Appn No. 278 of 1896-97 on the file of this Court & prays the claim be got the Govt Prosecutor in the said Appn. This Court has no power to try the attaching Creditor decree & order passed by the Court in dispute are Davadoya lands & copy of this order may be sent to the Dy Comr for information & further necessary action.

12/2/97.

In the court of the Subordinate judge
Shimoga
Present P. Singara Charriboquire

Subordinate judge

Civil Mis appl. No. 220 of 1897 98

Petitioner ~~of~~ Counter Petitioner

Deputy Commissioner. 1 S. Linga setty
of Chitaldoorg. (Plaintiff

2 Bheemarao
(Deft).

25. 6. 97.

Petition by Mr Sundaram Iyer.

Cr Cav by Mr Jaker Rao.

order

As agreed by Mr. 4, 61, 62
As the case is to appear
be Dismissed and Decree
accordingly & Each
party to bear his
Claim & all over Court
costs. As the
Land
was made a charge
on the land the Cr. By
may have Recourse
Attached.

Munjappa

25/6/97.

Belagula Railway Station,

12th July 1922.

To

Rajamantrapravina

P. Raghavendra Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

First Member of Council to H.H.the Maharaja

of Mysore, Bangalore.

Most Respected Sir,

I the undersigned most respectfully inviting your kind attention to my memorial dated 20th November 1921 addressed to the Dewan of Mysore regarding the resumption of Government of Personal Inam lands granted in 1807 to my great grand father Fouzdar Govinda Rao of Chitaldrug by the late Maharaja Sri Krishnarajendra Wodayar Bhadur, I beg to request that early favourable order may kindly be passed on my above said memorial.

2. I further respectfully beg to request that your honour wishes to inspect the spot before passing orders you may depute any officer, and if I be informed of the date on which he inspects, I shall be ready to follow to the spot and explain the state of affairs, etc.

3. I respectfully beg that you will take up the records and pass favourable orders.

With best regards.

I beg to remain,

Most respected Sir,

Your most obedient & humble servant,

Station Master,
M.A. Railways, Belagula.

70

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

*Diary No. of letter replied to*_____

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, the *191* .

Date of issue_____

Signed by_____

Section

File No.

Serial No

No.

To

In reply to his application dy 12th July 19[illegible] about the sivan land entered in the chavara kasava Devaswom and Rama Devaswom Register at Folio [illegible] in the Chirakkara Taluk in [illegible]

over.

Last of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

72

Belagula Railway Station,

Belagula, 6th August 1922.

To The Secretary to Government, of Mysore,

Muzroy Department,

Bangalore.

Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt of your No. 579/Muz.389 21 dated 1st August 1922 Re. personal Inamati lands granted by His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore to Subedar Govinda Rao of Chitaldrug, I respectfully beg to bring to your kind notice that the lands were granted to the above said Govinda Rao but not to Sri Chennakeshava Devaru and Prana Devaru and I beg of you to kindly note and correct this for favour of your consideration and final orders on my long standing prayers and also to kindly let me know the exact date of your inspection of the lands under question to enable me to be present on the day to explain the matter clearly.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C. Venkataraoo

Station Master,
Belagula Railway Station.

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

Muzarai Department

BANGALORE.

REV.SECRETARIAT.
22-23
MUZRAI
743.

Sir, Muz 389-21-8

On receipt of endorsement No: 579/Muz: 389-21, dated the 1st instant, granted to me by you informing me of the intention of - Government to have the Inam lands inspected by the Muzarai Super--intendent, I brought to your kind notice in my memorial of 6th August '22, the mistake under which the Government seem to be - - labouring about the person to whom the lands in question were - - granted.

The endorsement mentions as if the lands were granted to Sre Channakasavadevaru and Pranadevaru Temples at Kelakote village - Chitaldurg Taluk. I once again take this opportunity of keeping the Government correctly informed about this matter. The lands were given to my great grand father Subedar Govindarao, of Chitaldrug by His Highness The Maharaja of Mysore, and not to the temples referred to by - - Government.

I beg that you may be pleased to kindly inform me the exact on which the Muzarai Superintendent will inspect the lands, so th I may also make it convenient to wait upon him, to offer such exp -nation as may be necessary.

With best regards,

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

C Venkatarao.

Station Master, Belgula
Railway Station, Mysore Railway

Belagula.

Dated 22nd August 22.

SUBJECT .....

Diary No. of letter replied to

Section

File No.

Serial No

Muzrai Secretariat

the

No. 2102
one file of the record
within the papers.

Date of issue 18.1.23

To

Signed by

~~that~~ you will be so
good as to inspect the
samples in question and
the mean Land enclosed herein, interrogate
the Petitioner on the subject
and send up a further
detailed report for orders
& steps in the progress
of the ~~application & accompanying~~
for the registration
the said Land to his
possession.

2) The applications received
in this office are returned
for ref. & re- Submn

Asst. Collr.

2/1/23

Dy
2/1/23

Recd
18.1.23

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563- GPB—2,500—27 7 22

Mdg 22-23
Snapfile

Office of the Sub-Collector in Tanjore
Dated, Nanjore, the 20th February 1923

21E

D 1661
Press 18
22-2-2
Mis. 389-21.

3161 From

Chandy, Joaquim, B.A.,
Sub-Collector in Tanjore,
Nanjore.

Mdg
22 FEB 1923
To

C.T. Jayaram Aiyar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of the Minister
the Maharaja of Travancore, Revenue Department,
Trivandrum.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.210-C/Mis.389-21 of the 1st January last forwarding for a detailed report after personal inspection, the records pertaining to the petition of P. V. Venkatarama Aiyar praying for the restoration to him of the Inam lands enjoyed by the Sri Chennakesava Nayar and Rama Nayar of Veelichodu village near Whitefield Farm, I have the honor to state that I inspected the place with the petitioners on the 9th instant. The Deputy Commissioner and the Malur Village Munsif were also present. The temple was found to be in good condition. The Archaeological

Name of village.	S.No.	Extent.	Assessment	Noted In a land
Veelichodu	77 dry	1-30	1-4-0	
	74 "	12-50	20-0-0	Entered to the
	139 "	2-1	6-0-0	
	137 "	0-25		Veelichodu to the
	Kudi Warden	4-5	12-0-0	Chief, the petitioner
	Total		39-4-0	

has also claimed the Inam land and to one Somasekara Reddy of Veelichodu village and one of the Dharmadarsis of the Temple, on a rental of Rs.39-4-0. All the lands except the kudi are under cultivation. The land is of a good soil capable of improvement by supplying a large quantity of manure. The petitioner has applied for the land

institution in September 1918, providing an annual reserve
At the end of January 1923, the temple had at its credit R
It is proposed to utilise this for getting a new car for the
Brahmotsava in the temple.

With regard to the petitioner's claim to these lands, he appears to have been convinced that it was not possible now to go behind the decision at the Inam settlement declaring the lands as Devadaya and that the only consideration that could be shown to him is to give him the first refusal of the lease of the lands on the expiry of the present lease by the end of 1923-24, i.e., in June 1924 since he promises to remain at the place and look to the improvement of the lands for the benefit of the institution. As Government in their Order No.2101/Muz.197-22-3 dated 18th January 1923 have laid it down that Devadaya lands need not be auctioned for getting the highest bid, and the good preservation of the lands is the important consideration, the lease of the lands to the petitioner for the same period appears to be desirable.

The entire records received with your letter under reply are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be.

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Alexandy

Muzrai Commissioner.

mh

1735-
Cruz Br.

From Office of the Asst. Commissioner (Work),
Dated, Bangalore, the 5th June 1931.

389-21-11

Capt. Squire, A.,
Asst. Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

W. L. Jayaram Aiyar, Esq., B.A., A.M.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore, Revenue Department.
Bangalore.

In continuation of my letter No.1041 of the 21st January last, I have the honor to forward herewith petition from G. Veerappa Gowda, Operator, Jewell Filter, Municipal, Mysore, urging his claim to the Inam lands granted to his ancestors by the Mysore Government and Board Department of Wells of the Mysore type, on the ground that he is the lineal descendant (in the female line) of Gowda, Patel of Kasaba Hobli, Mysore Taluk, and that the claim of Archaka of Sri Chamundeswari Temple should be referred till after the consultation. Asst. Commissioner has not made a further communication in the matter.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K. Ananda Rao

Asst. Commissioner.

79

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

(put up)

(re Sri Chaunakesava Devaru & Prana Devaru temples at Keelakote, chitalidrug from)

Mrez Comrs no. D 1735

The connected file no. 389-1921 was submitted to the 1st member for orders on 27/2/1923.

If the file could be got back, the proper receipt will be entered on the date in that file. I do not think for orders.

27/2/23

To the Revenue Asst & the Asst member with an file. The file may be sent back to the accountant early tomorrow morning with orders & duly. Which will be done at once.

B.A
5/3/23 Pt

N B Should routine notes be written on small slips the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

Sub.

The file referred to above is

N B. - Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must de copied, or slips pasted on this form.

W D 1880—GPB—1,50 000—2|5-21

Muz 4]

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, the *192* .

Date of issue 23.3.23

Signed by Mr. T.E. Tripura

Section

File No. 35a...4

Serial No. 12

No. 2543

Overtended records with petns

To

The Muz. Commr

Sir,

Adverting to correspondence ending with your letter no. C. 104 dt 6-3-1923 forwarding petition from Rai C. Koneri Rao, Mr. Fire urging his

The 12.3.23

21/3

Devasu and Sri Rama
Devasu at Keelakote
near chitaldrug town,
§ I am directed
to send herewith the
record connected with the
case, and to request that
the matter may be
thoroughly investigated
and a clear trial report
submitted. The enclosed
Encls

I have &c.

(Sd) Asst Secretary

20/3/23

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27-7 22

37426

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Dated, Bangalore, the 14th April 1923.

From

K. Chandy, Esq., B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

391-21-13

T.T. Jayarama Aiyar, Esq., B.A. B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore, Revenue Department,

Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.2543/Muz.389-21-13 dated the 23rd March 1923, returning for further report, the records connected with the claim of Mr. C. Venkata Rao and C. Koneri Rao, to the Inam lands endowed to Sri Chennakesavadevaru and Sri Pranadevaru at Seelakote near Chitaldrug town, I have the honor to state that from enquiries made of Mr. Narayan Sreenivasa Rao regarding the genuineness of the genealogical table presented by Koneri Rao, it is ascertained that Koneri Rao is the direct descendent of the Pouzdar, the founder of the institutions, while Venkata Rao the original petitioner belongs to the family of the second wife's son of the Pouzdar given in adoption to his brother. A copy of Mr. Narayan Sreenivasa Rao's letter also is enclosed. He states that Koneri Rao is quite competent to manage the estate. I have also seen the young man and he seems to be capable.

Venkata Rao relies for the support of his claim on the documents mentioned in certain petitions presented by his father (copies of which are put up herewith), but he cannot be allowed to enjoy them in the light of the facts brought forth above.

In these circumstances, I beg to recommend that the lea of the Inam lands may, after its expiry by the end of 1923-24, be given to Koneri Rao in preference to Venkata Rao.

The entire records received with your letter under reply are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

85

Copy of D.O. dated 11th March 1923, from Mr. Karpur Shrinivas Rao, Chamarajpet, Bangalore, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore:--

---

"I am in receipt of your D.O.No.1041 dated 5/6th instant regarding certain inam lands granted to the late Fouzdar Govinda Rao for the benefit of two temples at Chitaldrug.

I may say the late Mr. Govinda Rao, Fouzdar, was my mother's paternal grand-father as shown in the geneological table sent by you. The entries therein shown are correct to the best of my knowledge and I am sure that the family of Venkata Rao referred to in your letter is different from that of the late Fouzdar Govinda Rao being alienated by adoption as shown.

The surviving members of Mr. Govinda Rao's family are Koneri Rao, descendent of Koneri Rao the first son of the Fouzdar and Ramachandra, adopted son of Venkata Rao, the latter being the grandson of the Fouzdar through his third wife's son Bhama Rao. Ramachandra is yet a minor and Venkata Rao referred to in your D.O. being a different stock cannot lay claim to the estate of the Fouzdar.

Accordingly the inam lands in question may be entrusted for management to Koneri Rao, Operator, Jewel Filter, Mysore, without prejudice to the legal claim of the minor Ramachandra Rao noted above. Koneri Rao is quite competent to manage the estate, and in my opinion more so than Venktarao, and he may be expected to carry out the donor's intentions."

Copy.

K. Srinivasa Rao

for Muzrai Commissioner. 14/4/23.

37809

$6. D2000
Mus 389-21-
SECRETARIAT
APR 1923
14

ıe Muzroy Secretary,

M y s o r e Government,

B a n g a l o r e.

Most Respected Sir,

I the undersigned humble petitioner, beg to bring to your goodself's kind notice and benevolent orders:-

Being given to understand, that one Mr.G.Venkata Rao, Station Master, Mysore Railways, a relative of mine has approached the Government for the awardal of personal Inamti of garden and Kelakote village connected to Sri Chennakesava Devaru and Sri Prana Devaru, at Chitaldrug granted to Fouzdar Govinda Rao of Chitaldrug by His late Highness Sree Krishnarajendra Wodyar, and the Government have passed orders in favour of the above said Venkata Rao on his misrepresentation that he is the heir, I most humbly beg to approach your goodself to bring to your kind notice that I am the living heir of Fouzdar Koneri Rao the eldest son of Fouzdar Govinda Rao the earner of the Inamti, whereas the above said Venkata Rao belongs to the adopted family as can be clearly seen by the Genealogical Table of Fouzdar Govinda Rao herewith enclosed for your goodself's kind perusal i.e. the above named Venkata Rao's grand father Venkata Rao was adopted to Sreenivasa Rao brother of Fouzdar Govinda Rao.

Fouzdar Koneri Rao is the eldest son of Fouzdar Govinda Rao and not his brother as is being represented by the above named Mr.Venkata Rao, which I am given to understand, he has done so, to show that he is the lawful heir which in fact

87

is not so, as can be seen by the enclosed table whereas I stand the great-great-grandson of Fouzdar Koneri Rao the eldest son of Fouzdar Govinda Rao.

As to the genuineness of the table herewith submitted I humbly beg to invite your goodself's kind reference to Mr. Karpur Sreenivasa Rao, the Retired Chief Engineer, Mysore Government who is great grandson of Fouzdar Govinda Rao being his grand daughter Venkoo Bai's son.

Further I beg to bring to your goodself's kind notice that the personal yearly cash grant of Rs.400/- granted to Fouzdar Koneri Ra during his regime and enjoyment of Inamti and management of the Temple in the year 1812 for padathera Deeparadhana of Chennakesava Devaru and Prana Devaru may also be caused to be awarded in favour of me in addition to the above Inamti who is the lawful heir to the Chitaldrug Family being the descendant of Fouzdar Koneri Rao as already stated.

Further I beg to bring to your goodself's kind notice that since the Chennakesava Devaru and Prana Devaru Temples were built by my ancestor Fouzdar Govinda Rao, out of his self earned money and the Inamti lands attached to the above Devarus earned by him, as already stated above, I most humbly beg to approach your goodself to request to entrust the management of the temples and hand over the Inamti lands attached to the Temples, by so doing I beg to say that the ideas and motives of the builder of the temples will be thoroughly fulfilled. Further I beg to pledge that I will manage the institution according to the Muzroy Scale (doing Devatharadhara etc). In this connection I beg to bring to your goodself's kind notice that the management of the Institutions was only under the control of all the previous enjoyers during each of their control and enjoyment I am given to understand that additions

88

and improvements are made, for instance Fouzdar Govinda Rao's eldest son Fouzdar Koneri Rao brought the Utsava Vigraha Sri Devi and Bhudevi (ಉತ್ಸವ ವಿಗ್ರಹ ಶ್ರೀದೇವಿ ಭೂದೇವಿ) from Sirpur when he fought the Battle of Sirpur with General Wellesly.

Under these representations I once more beg to request your goodself to entrust the management of the Temples and hand over the Inamti lands attached to the Temples, so that the name of the Family which remains erased since the last 20 years may be re-established, and Devatharadhana Poojas and Utsavas (ದೇವತಾರಾಧನೆ ಪೂಜೆ ಉತ್ಸವ) may be celebrated under my management by the lawful heir of the Family.

Under these facts I humbly beg to request your goodself once again that the awardal of Inamti and cash grant etc, may be ordered in my favour.

For which act of kindness I shall feel deeply indebted to your goodself, most respected Sir,

I beg to remain,

Most Respected Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

ಎ ಸುಬ್ಬರಾಯ

Operator, Jewell Filters,
Vani Vilasa Water Works,
Vontikoppal, Mysore.

M y s o r e.

19 - 4 - 1923.


Govinda Rao — Brother Srinivasa Rao.
First wife's Sons
Second wife's Son
Adopted
Third wife's Son
1 Ranga Rao
2 Bhima Rao
3 Krishna Rao
Venkata Rao
Shama Rao
Bache Rao
Venkola Rao
Rama Rao
Raghama.
Bachamma
Venkata Rao
Govinda Rao
3 an
Bore Venkato
Mr her frm Srini.
Vasa Rao mott.
living
Ranga Rao
Govinda Rao
Krishnamoorthy Rao living.
Venkata Rao living
previous applicant.
Bache Rao
+ 3 daughters.
2 daughters.
Have male issues
wife of above has
adopted one Rama
Chandra Rao.
Srinivasa Rao
Krishna Rao
Venkata Rao
Raghavendra Rao
Sundramma.
Srinivasa Rao
Seshamma.
Venkatari
Mr Konfm
Srinivasa
Rao wife.
Ranga Rao
present applicant
Bhima Rao
Govinda Rao
Chito.
female child
Govinda Rao
Chito

Mur 41

SUBJECT ....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, the *192* .

Section Mur

File No. 389-21

Serial No. 15

No. 2741

Date of issue 27.4.23

Signed by M. T. E. Stigge

To

The Inam Supdt

Sir,

I am directed to request that you will be so good as to furnish me with copies of the details from Register of Inam Enquiries relating to [illegible]

Rs as in margin

R. R. P.

21 6 6

5 12 0

3 8 4

1 38 0

8 9

24 0 5

8 5 29

6 5 5

4 5 39

44 1 38

Rs as in margin

Fasly 4

1861

62

Quarter

[illegible] over [illegible]

Sri Channakesava Devaru
and Sri Rama Devaru
temples at Kelasole near
Chitaldrug, together with copies
Mark of the Statements
with enclosures if any, filed
at the time of the
Rama settlement.

9 hours old

Hon. Rec. Secretary

9/28/4/23

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27-7-22

39855

Per Regd Post.

The Revenue Secretary to the Government of

H.H. The Maharaja of Mysore, B 2111

Muzrai Department,

B A N G A L O R E. 389-21-6

Respected Sir,

Subject:- [illegible]

Re. Inam lands granted to House of [illegible] in the above village Chikka Durga Taluk, by [illegible] furnish in the year Prabhava [illegible] for the [illegible] of [illegible] Chikka [illegible] [illegible] of the place.

(1). In the above [illegible] said [illegible] family of the Housdar house [illegible] Sheers for the puja of [illegible] Mukhya Prandeva [illegible] installed by the Housdar, [illegible] granted to be enjoyed by [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] hereditarily.

(2). That [illegible] Durga, Varkala [illegible] lastly served [illegible] under the [illegible] Government and [illegible] This [illegible] the [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

he is one of the heirs and requesting that the [illegible] of the said land, may be given to him.

(7). Upon this a notice being served by the Federal Commissioner to appear before him at the next [illegible] day, the applicant before him, the other as [illegible] the land [illegible] and [illegible] the same one [illegible]

(8). [illegible] because this letter might have been written, [illegible]

(9) [illegible]

No: 296
Enc: Two.

Office of the Superintendent
Mysore Rev Survey,
Bangalore, Dated 14th May 23

From

D. K. Darashah, Esq B A,
Superintendent of Rev Survey &
Settlements in Mysore.

16 MAY 1923 REV
MUZRAI

To

J. E. Jayarama Iyer, Esq B A, B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore
Rev Department

Sir,

As requested in your letter No. 2741/ Muz. 389-21-15 dated 27-4-1923, I have the honor to forward herewith 4 copies of Inam and Statement pertaining to the grant of Inam lands to Sri Chenna-Kesava devaru & Sri Ramadevaru temples at Kelakote, Cheluldrug Taluk.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient Servant
D. K. Darashah
Superintendent of
Rev Survey & Settlements
in Mysore

389-21-15
D 2122

Kelagotay - Village.
Ellefalcbug - Jaluit

Copy of the Register of Inams in the village of Kelgotay

CLASS, EXTENT AND VALUE OF INAM

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No. and name of field or fields comprised in the grant. Dry, wet or garden	Extent: Local measure. Even where the local measure is in acres, guntas, and annas, it is to be entered in this column	Extent: Measure in acres and their fractions in decimals
1	2	3	4	5
		Old extent as per Amildar's accht compiled from Chittah of 1832-33. No Tymaishy being available.		
		Dry.	103 Cand. 10 Cood.	
		Wet.	9 do. 7 do.	
1	Devadaya	Dry		
		No: 4		24
		" 61		8·13
		" 62		8·73
		Dry		40·86
		Garden		4·12
			1 Candy 14 Cood. + 6¼ seers. (Dry) = 22·99 + Wet 1 Candy = 2·07	44·98
		Total	25·06	40·86 Dry 4·12 Garden
				44·98
				Inam Dry. 23·63 2·36
				25·99
				Excess 14·87.
				Garden. Inam 2·37 Excess 1·85.

Sammat of Chitaldroog in the Taluk of Chitaldroog 7

		DESCRIPTION, TENURE AND	
Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam	
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government, the cess paid by the ryots to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7		If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for tanks, buildings, &c., whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, &c or liable to quit-rent, i. e, jodi, &c., amount o latter to be entered
6	7	8	9
	Scale survey acct. 1422. acres. 1 Coad = '68 den 7 do 1 do = '04		
	21 5 3.12 29.12 8.4	Granted for the purpose of growing flowers to:- for offering to Pranadevar of Kelgotay	Free.
29-1-6	38 Rates Dry No. 4 — 14 ans. " 61 - 10 - " " 62 - 7 " Average. " - 10 - 4. Garden 2 Rs. 13 - 4 - 8 3 - 11 - 2 16 - 15 - 10 or 17 Rs. on account of excess.	Temple in good order, and the service continued	

By whom granted, and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim, original sanad, all miscellaneous documents, and other proofs of long possession. In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or without grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, &c., and the general specification of terms of all documents produced should be given.
10	11
Granted by Dewan Poorniah in 1807.	One Summud dy in 1808 addressed to the Subh Govinda row saying that 10 Pags. worth of land granted to him for excavating a well, growing Tooley, flowers &c., for the service of Pranadevar, whom a Temple shd be built. The land to be hereditarily.

of Chitaldroog 95/

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Poornah up to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
Govinda Row	Jarry Inamty.	Jarry Inamty accts. 1834. Chennakesava Swamy 2 Candies - 14 Coods - 6 1/4 Seers Survey acct. 1867. Same - 44 ac - 39 goont.

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owner. If the inam has been subdivided, the name, &c., of each sharer should be entered in the columns			
Residence, name and age, &c.	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders, possession how obtained, and in what year
15	16	17	18
Kelgotay near Chitaldroog. — Chennakesava devar & Pranadevar. — The land is in the Sole and hereditary enjoyment of			
1. Vencobarow ⁂	great grand-Son.	one Son	Enjoys one.
2. Bheemarow ⁂	do.	"	One-half.
3. Shamarow ⁂ who Support the Devastan & get the flowers, &c., offered.	Son of grantee	one Son.	one-fourth.

Division

LENGTH OF POSSESSION

Abstract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam. Assistant's opinion and recommendation	Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissioner
19	-0
This grant, though continued expressly to one family, is Devadaya. The temple goes by the name of 'Kesavadevar goody' but there is in it Pranadevar also, and the object for wh: the Inam was originally bestowed is carried on. + Recommended to be confirmed so long as the Temple and the Services specified are supported, under Rule V, subject to escess in dry land 14-87@0-10-4 = Rs 9-8 do garden 3 24@2 - = 6-8 16-0-0. v rus 16. — (Sd) V N Narasimhaiengar asstt. 29-5-68.	To be Confirmed subject to Rs 17- on account of escess (Sd) B. Gopaliah. asstt. 23-10-68. Confirmed subject to a quit-rent of Rs 17- (Sd) J. Clerk. Inam Commissioner Octr 24th 68.

"Copy"

Superintendent of Revenue Survey and Inam Settlements in Mysore

12 5 23

GEN. SECTT. 16 MAY 1923 MUSRAI D.2727

From

Rajamantrapravina, P. Raghavendra Rao, Esqr., B.A., B.L.,

Senior Member of H.H.The Maharaja's Council,

B A N G A L O R E.

103

Most Respected Sir,

Subject:- Musrai, F. No. 389-21.

Re. Inam Lands granted to Fousdar Govinda Rao's family in Kelagote village Chitaldurg Taluk, by Mr. Purniah in the year Prabhava about 117 years back for the ~~year~~ up-keep of Sri Channekesava Swamy Temple at the place.

(1). In the above Sannad it is said that the family of the Fousdar should put on Tulasi and other trees for the puja of Sri Mukhya Pranadevaru Temple installed by the Fousdar, Govinda Rao and the lands granted to be enjoyed by his descendant's family hereditarily.

(2). That Fousdar's Govinda Rao's son, Mr. Chitaldurg, Venkata Rao held several respectable posts and lastly served as an Anchey Bukshee (Post-Master-general under this benign Government and died in Bangalore at his sixteeth year when my father was about 23 years old. That the grandson of Fousdar, Govinda Rao (my father) Mr. C. Nana Rao was a Risaldar and retired in his fifteen year and died in his nienty-third year about 8 years back

(3). ~~When~~ I was directed by the Muzraii Commissioner to appear before him at Chitaldurg when he camped there for the inspection of these lands endowed to the above institution. I was assured by the Commissioner that the enjoyment of the said lands would be given over to me on certain conditions and accordingly a recommendation would be submitted to Government.

(4). In the mean-while, one Mr. C. Konari Rao has very recently presented an application stating that he

P.T.O.

he is one of the heirs and requesting that the management of the said lands may be given to him.

(5). Upon this a notice being served to me by the Muzrai Commissioner to appear before him on the 27th March 23 for enquiry, I appeared before him, when a letter was read over to me by the Muzrai Commissioner said to have been received by Rajasabhabhusana Karpur Srinivasa Rao purporting to be that my grand-father was adopted to the other family and that Konari Rao was the heir and if the management of the lands were given to him he would manage better.

(6). I very respectfully beg to submit the following for the information of the benign Government.

(I). The information given by Mr. Karpur Srinivasa Rao is not to be relied upon; because this letter may have been written, to give shelter to his widowed sister who is living with him. The widowed sister who is my uncle's wife (issueless) and who I hear, has recently adopted only 2 years back, after I petitioned Government for the restoration of these inam lands. This adoption was not known to me or to my brother Mr. C. Krishnamurty Rao who is a clerk of the General and Revenue Secretariat and who is living in Bangalore City.

(II). My father who lived for 93 years never mentioned to me or to my brother that his father was adopted. Mr. Karpur Srinivasa Rao is only 63 years old and I do not know how this gentleman got the information that my grand father was adopted some hundred years back.

(III). If Mr. Karpur Sreenivasa Rao or any other person produces any documentary evidence or any person

P.T.O.

giving personal evidence, whose age should be equal to that of my grand-father Mr.C.Venkata Rao Re. the adoption ~~then it~~ may be relied upon

IV. I respectfully beg to submit that the Inam lands may be handed over to any person if the Government is satisfied that my Grand-father was adopted to the other family.

(7). The original applications presented by the last enjoyee, my cousin brother, C. Bheema Rao for an appointment to the Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldurg, on 8-1-87 says that his uncle i.e., my father and grand-father, Mr. C. Venkata Rao were Risaldar and Unche Bhakshi in this Government. I have also got several other petitions written by my cousi brother, C. Bheema Rao, last enjoyer of the said Inam lands, in his own hand-writing to prove that I am the descendent of the late Fousdar, Govinda Rao.

(8). I may be kindly permitted to mention that my father and my grand-father were Mysore Government Officers in several different places (not in Chitaldurg) and were not able to be present before the Inam Commissioner when the Inam settlement took place and the settlement has been made in their absence.

(9). In conclusion I most respectfully beg that the facts above mentioned may kindly be taken to the gracious consideration of the benign Government and suitable orders be passed in the matter.

For which act of kindness I shall ever be thankful.

I beg to remain,

Most respecter Sir,

C Venkatarao

Station Master,
Mysore Rail[illegible],
Handa[illegible].

BANGALORE.

12th May 87.

Muz 4j

SUBJECT Passing orders ~~in~~ Restoration of Inam land endowed to Sri Kalikambal Umamaheswaraswami Temple in the Chittal dry Tk

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Muzrai Secretariat

(

, *the* 192 .

Section Inam

File No. 389 - 24

Serial No. 18-

No. 150

Date of issue 25.7.24

Signed by R. Subbarayappa

To

The Inspector of Muzrai

Sir,

Adverting to correspondence ending with your letter no. C. 10401 Dy/II 6 23 reporting on the claims of Rao C. Venkata Rao and C. Kanaki Rao to the Inam Lands endowed to Sri Kalikambal Umamaheswaraswami Temple of Kalikapuram

over.

near Chitaldrug town,
I am directed to
observe that the Govt
having decided so far
back as 1903 that the
lands in question were
Devadaya Inam and
that their alienation by
the then Manager should
be cancelled and the
lands resumed and
restored to the temple,
that order is quite
conclusive and Govt
are not prepared
to go behind it at
this distance of time.

2. With regard to the
applications of C. Venkata Rao
and ~~the late~~ C. Lingaraja Rao ~~claimant~~
who have now ~~come~~
~~forward and~~ as next
for their being put in
possession of the lands,

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—GPB—2,500—27-7-22

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

Govt Cons. dtd that 108
~~has to be noted that~~
~~none~~ either of them can be recognized to have any claim for the lands which ~~have~~ were declared to be the property of the temple about 20 years ago. ~~and~~ Their applications ~~have~~ are therefore ~~Forbe~~ rejected and they may be informed accordingly.

3. It is for the local authorities to decide how these lands should be disposed of in the best interests of the temple whether they might be leased out, and if so, to whom and for what period. I ~~have~~ am however to observe that in leasing out the lands, it is desirable not to give the lease to either of the parties, who

claiming the same for themselves as personal grant, as it will give rise to future complications and troubles by their taking advantage of the lease to secure permanent possession of the lands for themselves. I am to request you to take necessary action accordingly.

(2) The records are herewith returned.

J Hanoda

Asst 25/7/23

Rec'd

25/7/23